

## REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed May 21, 2009. A Request for a One Month Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) is submitted herewith, along with the fee prescribed by 37 CFR 1.17(a)(1). Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7-12, 15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31-34, 36, 37, 43, 47, 48, and 57 were examined, and all stand rejected. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's reasons for rejecting Claims 1, 7-12, 15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31-34, 36, 37, 43, 47, 48 and 57. Nevertheless, Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 24 solely for the purpose of expediting further prosecution, and should not be construed as an Applicants' concession to the rejections. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims, and other claims, in continuing applications.

Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 24, and Applicants have added new Claims 64-66, which depend from claim 1, and new claims 67-69, which depend from claim 24. Support for Applicants' claim amendments and new claims can be found throughout Applicants' specification, particularly at page 4, lines 13-20. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added. As discussed below, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and Applicants earnestly request such action.

Claims 1, 7, 10, 15, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31-32, 43, 47, 48 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0054990 to Nakamura et al. ("Nakamura") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0034934 to Brewer and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0085867 to Grabert. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

### Claims 1, 7, 10, 15, 47 and 48

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method of advertising or promoting. The method comprises projecting a light pattern comprising one or more illuminated areas from a projector onto a screen. The light pattern defines a message or announcement area. The method further comprises projecting a picture from the projector onto said screen into said one or more illuminated areas. Outlines of the one or more illuminated areas correspond to outlines of the screen, and each of the one or more illuminated areas has a shape of an icon or a shape of letters.

The combination of Nakamura, Brewer and Grabert does not teach or suggest at least “projecting a light pattern comprising one or more illuminated areas ... and projecting a picture ... into said one or more illuminated areas; ... wherein each of the one or more illuminated areas has a shape selected from the group consisting of an icon and a letter,” as recited in Claim 1. Rather, Nakamura discloses an image display system including single-color projection units 10x, image display devices 11x, drive circuits 12x, light sources 13x, single lenses 14x, a screen 30, an imager 40 and an arithmetic correction operation section 50. Fig. 1, paras. 31-40. At best, Nakamura describes image projection generally. Nakamura does not teach or suggest the illuminated areas as having a shape of an icon or a letter, as now recited in Claim 1.

Brewer discloses various vanity display devices 10. In the Office action at page 3, the Examiner points to the embodiment shown in Figure 10 and described in paragraph 56. That embodiment includes the vanity display device 10 “affixed to an apparatus for transportation 50 for viewing text, graphics and digital photographs in the form of private or commercial vanity displays and in the contexts of advertising and general use. The electronic vanity display device 10 further compris[es] a logo vanity screen 310 for viewing vanity displays which is constructed as a shape and logo of private and commercial designations such as signage specifications for a specific operator or vendor.” Brewer does not even relate to image projection. Brewer certainly does not teach or suggest illuminated areas having a shape of an icon or a letter, as now defined in Claim 1.

Grabert discloses a solid-state projection device incorporating a light source, modulator, and control circuitry on a single chip. Abstract. In the Office action at page 3, the Examiner points to paragraph 110 of Grabert. That paragraph describes that Grabert’s system can be used to replace instrumentation panels. The following paragraph teaches that a display area of a projection may take various shapes, which may change dynamically. Like Nakamura, Grabert at best describes image projection generally. Grabert does not teach or suggest one or more illuminated areas, each having a shape of an icon or a letter, as now defined in Claim 1.

The benefits of Applicants’ claimed method are described throughout the specification. Particularly, however, paragraph 13 of Applicants’ publication describes that “[t]he idea of providing still or motion pictures in a projected light pattern is useful as sales advertisement and promotion tool ... The idea is to create a connection between e.g. a company and what it produces or sells. Thus, the illuminated areas may define a logo of a company or anything else,

and with the living pictures inside the logo, a story is presented to a viewer looking at the logo. An example could be a logo for COCA COLA<sup>®</sup>, where people drinking COCA COLA<sup>®</sup> are shown in the illuminated areas forming the logo.”

The shapes of the illuminated areas, being meaningful by themselves, cause an entirely different experience for the viewer. The viewer rationally, and typically subconsciously, extracts meaning from the shapes of the illuminated areas (icon or letters) and at the same time experiences the content being shown within the illuminated areas. In this way, the illuminated areas become an integral part of the experience, and the experience is enhanced due to the coupling between the meaning of the shapes of the illuminated areas and the content shown within. The advantages described in the foregoing paragraphs cannot possibly be achieved by the combination of Nakamura, Brewer and Grabert, because none of those references, separately or in combination, teaches or suggests the limitations of Claim 1 discussed in the foregoing paragraphs.

Since neither Nakamura, nor Brewer, nor Grabert teaches or suggests the limitations of Claim 1 recited above, their combination also cannot teach or suggest these limitations. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 is allowable over Nakamura in view of Brewer and further in view of Grabert. Dependent Claims 7, 10, 15, 47 and 48, which include the features of independent Claim 1, recite additional features of particular advantage and utility. Moreover, these claims are allowable for substantially the same reasons presented above. Nakamura in view of Brewer and Grabert does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claim 1, let alone the unique combinations of features recited by Claims 7, 10, 15, 47 and 48. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

Claims 24, 25, 27, 28, 31-32, 43 and 57

Claim 24, as amended, recites an advertisement or promotion arrangement. The arrangement comprises means for projecting a light pattern comprising one or more illuminated areas defining a message or announcement area. Each of the one or more illuminated areas has a shape of an icon or a letter. The arrangement further comprises a screen onto which the light pattern is projected; means for projecting pictures into the one or more illuminated areas; and means for editing a digital image to define the one or more illuminated areas so that outlines of the one or more illuminated areas correspond to outlines of the screen.

The combination of Nakamura, Brewer and Grabert does not teach or suggest at least “means for projecting a light pattern comprising one or more illuminated areas defining a message or announcement area, each of the one or more illuminated areas having a shape selected from the group consisting of an icon and a letter; [and] means for projecting pictures into said one or more illuminated areas,” as now recited in Claim 24. Rather, Nakamura discloses an image display system including single-color projection units 10x, image display devices 11x, drive circuits 12x, light sources 13x, single lenses 14x, a screen 30, an imager 40 and an arithmetic correction operation section 50. Fig. 1, paras. 31-40. At best, Nakamura describes image projection generally. Nakamura does not teach or suggest “means for projecting a light pattern comprising one or more illuminated areas defining a message or announcement area, each of the one or more illuminated areas having a shape selected from the group consisting of an icon and a letter,” as now recited in Claim 24.

Brewer discloses various vanity display devices 10. In the Office action at page 3, the Examiner points to the embodiment shown in Figure 10 and described in paragraph 56. That embodiment includes the vanity display device 10 “affixed to an apparatus for transportation 50 for viewing text, graphics and digital photographs in the form of private or commercial vanity displays and in the contexts of advertising and general use. The electronic vanity display device 10 further compris[es] a logo vanity screen 310 for viewing vanity displays which is constructed as a shape and logo of private and commercial designations such as signage specifications for a specific operator or vendor.” Brewer does not even relate to image projection. Brewer certainly does not teach or suggest “means for projecting a light pattern comprising one or more illuminated areas defining a message or announcement area, each of the one or more illuminated areas having a shape selected from the group consisting of an icon and a letter,” as now recited in Claim 24.

Grabert discloses (e.g., in the Abstract) a solid-state projection device incorporating a light source, modulator, and control circuitry on a single chip. In the Office action at page 3, the Examiner points to paragraph 110 of Grabert. That paragraph describes that Grabert’s system can be used to replace instrumentation panels. The following paragraph teaches that a display area of a projection may take various shapes, which may change dynamically. Like Nakamura, Grabert at best describes image projection generally. Grabert does not teach or suggest “means for projecting a light pattern comprising one or more illuminated areas defining a message or

announcement area, each the one or more illuminated areas having a shape selected from the group consisting of an icon and a letter,” as now recited in Claim 24.

The benefits of Applicants’ claimed advertisement or promotion arrangement are described throughout the specification. Particularly, however, paragraph 13 of Applicants’ publication describes that “[t]he idea of providing still or motion pictures in a projected light pattern is useful as sales advertisement and promotion tool ... The idea is to create a connection between e.g. a company and what it produces or sells. Thus, the illuminated areas may define a logo of a company or anything else, and with the living pictures inside the logo, a story is presented to a viewer looking at the logo. An example could be a logo for COCA COLA<sup>®</sup>, where people drinking COCA COLA<sup>®</sup> are shown in the illuminated areas forming the logo.”

The shapes of the illuminated areas, being meaningful by themselves, cause an entirely different experience for the viewer. The viewer rationally, and typically subconsciously, extracts meaning from the shapes of the illuminated areas (icon or letters) and at the same time experiences the content being shown within the illuminated areas. In this way, the illuminated areas become an integral part of the experience, and the experience is enhanced due to the coupling between the meaning of the shapes of the illuminated areas and the content shown within. These advantages cannot possibly be achieved by the combination of Nakamura, Brewer and Grabert, because none of those references, separately or in combination, teaches or suggests the limitations of Claim 24 discussed in the foregoing paragraphs.

Since neither Nakamura, nor Brewer, nor Grabert teaches or suggests the limitations of Claim 24 recited above, their combination also cannot teach or suggest these limitations. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 24 is allowable over Nakamura in view of Brewer and further in view of Grabert. Dependent Claims 25, 27, 28, 31-32, 43 and 57, which include the features of independent Claim 24, recite additional features of particular advantage and utility. Moreover, these claims are allowable for substantially the same reasons presented above. Nakamura in view of Brewer and further in view of Grabert does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claim 24, let alone the unique combinations of features recited by Claims 25, 27, 28, 31-32, 43 and 57. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

The Examiner rejected Claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 17, 18, 33, 34, 36 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura, Brewer and Grabert further in view of U.S. Patent

No. 6,115,084 to Miyashita et al. ("Miyashita"). Claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 17 and 18 each depend from Claim 1, and therefore include all of the limitations of Claim 1. Claims 33, 34, 36 and 37 each depend from Claim 24, and therefore include all of the limitations of Claim 24. Claims 1 and 24 are allowable over Nakamura, Brewer and Grabert for the reasons provided above. Claims 1 and 24 are also allowable over Nakamura, Brewer and Grabert further in view of Miyashita, because Miyashita neither teaches nor suggests the limitations of Claims 1 and 24 that are lacking in Nakamura, Brewer and Grabert. In particular, the Examiner cited Miyashita because he alleges that Miyashita teaches "using black in non-display areas of a display," and "a method and arrangement, wherein the step of darkening comprises providing the color type 'black level 0' on the part surrounding said areas." Office action ("OA"), pp. 5-6. The limited purposes for which the Examiner cited Miyashita are irrelevant to the deficiencies in Nakamura, Brewer and Grabert that are discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 24. Accordingly, Claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 17, 18, 33, 34, 36 and 37 are all allowable for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to Claims 1 and 24, and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

The Examiner rejected Claims 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura, Brewer and Grabert further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0189753 to Lunde. Claims 27-31 each depend from Claim 24, and therefore include all of the limitations of Claim 24. Claim 24 is allowable over Nakamura, Brewer and Grabert for the reasons provided above. Claim 24 is also allowable over Nakamura, Brewer and Grabert further in view of Lunde, because Lunde neither teaches nor suggests the limitations of Claim 24 that are lacking in Nakamura, Brewer and Grabert. In particular, the Examiner cited Lunde because he alleges that Lunde teaches a projection screen made of an acrylic plastic wherein the front side is frosted or clear such as glass creating a translucent screen. See, OA, p. 7. The limited purpose for which the Examiner cited Lunde is irrelevant to the deficiencies in Nakamura, Brewer and Grabert that are discussed above with respect to Claim 24. Accordingly, Claims 27-31 are all allowable for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to Claim 24, and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

### CONCLUSION

For the reasons presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 7-12, 15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31-34, 36, 37, 43, 47, 48, 57, and 64-69, as amended, are allowable over the art of record, taken singly or in any combination that might reasonably have suggested itself to those of ordinary skill in the art as of the time the Applicants' claimed invention was made. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in now condition for allowance, and passage of the application to issue is therefore earnestly solicited.

Should there be any further issues that need to be addressed in the application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 11-1159.

Dated: September 18, 2009

Respectfully submitted,



Howard J. Klein  
Reg. No.: 28,727  
Attorney for Applicant  
Tel.: (949) 955-1920

Klein, O'Neill & Singh, LLP (Customer No.: 22145)  
43 Corporate Park, Suite 204  
Irvine, CA 92606  
Tel: (949) 955-1920  
Fax: (949) 955-1921  
Attorney Docket No.: 578-020.101